arXiv:1612.05869v1 [math.NT] 18 Dec 2016

LINEAR COMBINATIONS OF PRIME POWERS IN SUMS OF TERMS OF BINARY RECURRENCE SEQUENCES

N. K. MEHER AND S. S. ROUT

Abstract. Let $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ be a non-degenerate binary recurrence sequence with positive discriminant. Let $\{p_1, \ldots, p_s\}$ be fixed prime numbers and $\{b_1, \ldots, b_s\}$ be fixed non-negative integers. In this paper, we obtain the finiteness result for the solution of the Diophantine equation $U_{n_1} + \cdots + U_{n_t} = b_1 p_1^{z_1} + \cdots + b_s p_s^{z_s}$ under certain assumptions. Moreover, we explicitly solve the equation $F_{n_1} + F_{n_2} = 2^{z_1} + 3^{z_2}$, in non-negative integers n_1, n_2, z_1, z_2 with $z_2 \geq z_1$. The main tools used in this work are the lower bound for linear forms in logarithms and the Baker-Davenport reduction method. This work generalizes the recent work of Mazumdar and Rout [17] and Bertók, Hajdu, Pink and Rábai [2].

1. Introduction

The problem of finding specific terms of a linear recurrence sequence of some particular form has a very rich history. Pethő [18] and Shorey-Stewart [23] independently studied the perfect powers in linear recurrence sequences. In particular, they consider the Diophantine equation

$$U_n = x^z \tag{1.1}$$

in integers n, x, z with $z \geq 2$, where $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a linear recurrence sequence and proved under certain natural assumptions that (1.1) contain only finitely many perfect powers. For example, Fibonacci and Lucas numbers, respectively, of the form x^z, with $z > 1$ has been recently proved by Bugeaud, Mignotte and Siksek [7]. Similarly, finding all perfect powers in Pell sequence studied in [19] (see also [9]). There are several results on Fibonacci numbers of particular form. Here we have cited few of them. Literature for Fibonacci numbers of the forms $px^2 + 1, px^3 + 1, k^2 + k + 1, p^a \pm p^b + 1, p^a \pm p^b$ and $y^t \pm 1$ can be found in [8, 11, 12, 13, 22]. Pethő and Tichy [20] proved that there are only finitely many Fibonacci numbers of the form $p^a + p^b + p^c$, with p prime. Marques and Togbé [14] found all Fibonacci and Lucas numbers of the form $2^a + 3^b + 5^c$.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 11B37, Secondary 11D72, 11J86.
Keywords: Linear recurrence sequence, Diophantine equations, linear forms in logarithms, reduction method.

Recently, Bertók et al., [2] under some mild conditions gave finiteness result for the solutions of the Diophantine equation

$$U_n = b_1 p_1^{z_1} + \cdots + b_s p_s^{z_s} \tag{1.2}$$

in non-negative integers $z_1, \ldots, z_s$, where $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a binary non-degenerate recurrence sequence of positive discriminant, $p_1, \ldots, p_s$ are given primes and $b_1, \ldots, b_s$ are fixed integers.

Several authors studied the problem to find (n, m, z) such that

$$U_n + U_m = 2^z, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a fixed linear recurrence sequence. In the case of some special famous sequences, (1.3) have been studied [3, 4, 6, 15]. In [5], Bravo et al., investigated the Diophantine equation

$$F_n + F_m + F_l = 2^z, \tag{1.4}$$

in integers (n, m, l, z), where $\{F_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a Fibonacci sequence. In [17], Mazumdar and Rout extended equations (1.3) and (1.4) and gave a finiteness result for the solutions of the Diophantine equation

$$U_{n_1} + U_{n_2} + \cdots + U_{n_t} = p^z \tag{1.5}$$

in non-negative integers $n_1, \ldots, n_t$ and z, where $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a binary non-degenerate recurrence sequence of positive discriminant and p is a fixed prime.

In this article, we generalize the results due to Bertók et al., [2] and Mazumdar et al., [17] and consider the more general Diophantine equation

$$U_{n_1} + U_{n_2} + \cdots + U_{n_t} = b_1 p_1^{z_1} + \cdots + b_s p_s^{z_s} \tag{1.6}$$

in non-negative integers $n_1, \ldots, n_t, z_1, \ldots, z_s$, where $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a binary recurrence sequences of positive discriminant, $b_1, \ldots, b_s$ are fixed non-negative integers and $p_1, \ldots, p_s$ are given primes. Further, we determine all solutions of the Diophantine equation (1.6) for $t = s = 2$ in non-negative integers n_1, n_2, z_1, z_2 with $z_2 \geq z_1$ and the sequence $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is the classical Fibonacci sequence. To prove our main result, we use the lower bounds for linear form in logarithms of algebraic numbers and a version of Baker - Davenport reduction method.

2. Notations and Main Results

The sequence $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0} = \{U_n(P, Q, U_0, U_1)\}$ is called a binary linear recurrence sequence if the relation

$$U_n = PU_{n-1} + QU_{n-2} \ \ (n \geq 2) \tag{2.1}$$

holds, where $PQ \neq 0, U_0, U_1$ are fixed rational integers and $|U_0| + |U_1| > 0$. Then for $n \geq 0$

$$U_n = \frac{a\alpha^n - b\beta^n}{\alpha - \beta} \quad (\alpha \neq \beta), \tag{2.2}$$

where α and β are the roots of the polynomial $x^2 - Px - Q$ and $a = U_1 - U_0\beta$, $b = U_1 - U_0\alpha$. The sequence $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is called non-degenerate, if $ab\alpha\beta \neq 0$ and α/β is not a root of unity. Taking $P = Q = 1, U_0 = 0$ and $U_1 = 1$, the sequence $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ becomes the classical Fibonacci sequence and usually denoted by $\{F_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ and the corresponding $\alpha = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ and $\beta = (1 - \sqrt{5})/2$.

Throughout the paper, we assume that U_n is non-degenerate, $\sqrt{\Delta} = (\alpha - \beta) > 0$. The latter assumption implies that the sequence $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ have a dominant root and hence we can assume that $|\alpha| > |\beta|$.

In this paper, we prove the following.

Theorem 1. *Let $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ be a non-degenerate binary recurrence sequence with positive discriminant $\Delta > 0$. Let $p_1 \leqslant p_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant p_s$ be given, not necessarily distinct prime numbers and $b_1, \ldots, b_s$ be fixed non-zero positive integers. Put $K = \max_{1\leq i\leq s} b_i$. Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$, and write T_ϵ for the set of those solutions $(n_1, \ldots, n_t, z_1, \ldots, z_s)$ of (1.6), for which $z_s = \max_{1\leq i\leq s} z_i$ and further $z_i < (1 - \epsilon)z_s$ if $p_i = p_s$ for $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$. Then there exists an effectively computable constant C depending only on $\epsilon, \{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}, K, t, s, p_s$ such that all solutions $(n_1, \ldots, n_t, z_1, \ldots, z_s)$ in T_ϵ satisfy*

$$\max\{n_1, \ldots, n_t, z_1, \ldots, z_s\} < C.$$

Our next theorem illustrates Theorem 1, in which we explicitly determine all the solutions of the Diophantine equation $F_{n_1} + F_{n_2} = 2^{z_1} + 3^{z_2}$.

Theorem 2. *The solutions of the Diophantine equation*

$$F_{n_1} + F_{n_2} = 2^{z_1} + 3^{z_2} \tag{2.3}$$

in non-negative integers n_1, n_2, z_1, z_2 with $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq 0$ and $z_2 \geq z_1$ are

$$(n_1, n_2, z_1, z_2) \in \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (3,0,0,0), (5,0,1,1), (7,0,2,2), (11,0,3,4), (1,1,0,0), \\ (2,1,0,0), (2,2,0,0), (3,3,0,1), (4,1,0,1), (4,2,0,1), \\ (4,3,1,1), (5,5,0,2), (6,3,0,2), (6,4,1,2), (6,5,2,2), \\ (8,6,1,3), (9,1,3,3), (9,2,3,3), (10,9,3,4), (11,6,4,4). \end{array} \right\} \tag{2.4}$$

3. Auxiliary results

Before proceeding further, we recall some facts and tools which we will use later. We deduce the bound of F_n from the well known Binet form for Fibonacci sequence as

$$\alpha^{n-2} \leq F_n \leq \alpha^{n-1}. \tag{3.1}$$

Lemma 3.1. *There exist constants c_0 and c_1 such that following holds.*

(1) *For $c_0 = (|a| + |b|)/\sqrt{\Delta}$,*

$$|U_n| \leq c_0 |\alpha|^n. \tag{3.2}$$

(2) *For $c_1 = \max\left\{ \frac{2\log|\alpha|}{\log p_s}, \frac{\log|\alpha|(\log p_s + \log p_1)}{2\log p_1 \log p_s} \right\}$,*

$$z_s \leq c_1 n_1. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. For proof of the inequality (3.2) one can refer [17]. Since b_i are positive integers for $1 \leq i \leq s$, we deduce from (1.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} p_s^{z_s} \leq |b_1 p_1^{z_1} + \cdots + b_s p_s^{z_s}| = |U_{n_1} + \cdots + U_{n_t}| \leq |U_{n_1}| + \cdots + |U_{n_t}| \\ \leq t c_0 |\alpha|^{n_1} = p_s^{\frac{\log(tc_0) + n_1 \log|\alpha|}{\log p_s}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

If

$$\log(tc_0) > n_1 \log|\alpha|,$$

then from (3.4), z_s is bounded and hence Theorem 1 follows trivially. Thus we have,

$$z_s \leq \frac{2n_1 \log|\alpha|}{\log p_s}.$$

Further, for better lower bound, we may take

$$\log(tc_0) > \frac{n_1 \log|\alpha|(\log p_s - \log p_1)}{2\log p_1},$$

and in this case, Theorem 1 also easily follows. Thus, assuming on contrary and using (3.4), we get

$$z_s \leq \frac{n_1 \log|\alpha|(\log p_s + \log p_1)}{2\log p_1 \log p_s}. \tag{3.5}$$

This proves the inequality in (3.3). □

Let α be an algebraic number of degree d. Then the *logarithmic height* of the algebraic number α is given by

$$h(\alpha) = \frac{1}{d}\left(\log|a| + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \log\max(1, |\alpha^{(i)}|) \right),$$

where a is the leading coefficient of the minimal polynomial of α and the $\alpha^{(i)}$'s are the conjugates of α in $\mathbb{C}$.

To prove Theorem 1, we use lower bounds for linear forms in logarithms to bound the index n_1 appearing in (1.6). We need the following general lower bound for linear forms in logarithms due to Matveev [16].

Lemma 3.2 (Matveev [16]). *Let $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_t$ be real algebraic numbers and let $b_1, \ldots, b_t$ be rational integers. Let D be the degree of the number field $\mathbb{Q}(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_t)$ over $\mathbb{Q}$ and let A_j be real numbers satisfying*

$$A_j \geq \max\{Dh(\gamma_i), |\log \gamma_i|, 0.16\}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, t.$$

Assume that $B \geq \max\{|b_1|, \ldots, |b_t|\}$ and $\Lambda := \gamma_1^{b_1} \cdots \gamma_t^{b_t} - 1$. If $\Lambda \neq 0$, then

$$|\Lambda| \geq \exp\left(-1.4 \times 30^{t+3} \times t^{4.5} \times D^2(1 + \log D)(1 + \log B)A_1 \cdots A_t\right).$$

After getting the upper bound of n_1 which is generally too large, the next step is to reduce it. For this reduction purpose, we use a variant of the Baker-Davenport result [1]. Here, for a real number x, let $||x|| := \min\{|x - n| : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ denote the distance from x to the nearest integer.

Lemma 3.3 ([10]). *Suppose that M is a positive integer, and A, B are positive reals with $B > 1$. Let p/q be the convergent of the continued fraction expansion of the irrational number γ such that $q > 6M$, and let $\epsilon := ||\mu q|| - M||\gamma q||$, where μ is a real number. If $\epsilon > 0$, then there is no solution of the inequality*

$$0 < u\gamma - n + \mu < AB^{-m}$$

in positive integers u, m and n with

$$u \leq M \quad \text{and} \quad m \geq \frac{\log(Aq/\epsilon)}{\log B}.$$

Estimating the lower bounds for the height of elements in a number field of given degree is tough. However, for the quadratic fields we have the following lemma due to Pink and Ziegler [21].

Lemma 3.4 ([21]). *Let α is an algebraic number of degree two. Then $h(\alpha) \geq 0.24$ or is a root of unity.*

In order to apply Matveev's Theorem, we must ensure that Λ does not vanish. In this regard, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose $\Lambda_i := p_s^{z_s} \alpha^{-n_1} b_s a^{-1} \sqrt{\Delta}(1 + \alpha^{n_2 - n_1} + \cdots + \alpha^{n_i - n_1})^{-1} - 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t$. Let $r = \sqrt{\Delta}$ and c_1 be in Lemma 3.1(2). If $\Lambda_i = 0$, then*

$$n_1 \leq \max\left\{\frac{\log(i|b/a|)}{\log(|\alpha/\beta|)}, \frac{\log(i|b/a|)}{\log|\alpha|}, \frac{\log(b_s|r|/|a|)}{\log|\alpha|/p_s^{c_1}}\right\}.$$

Proof. Proof follows from [17, Lemma 3.5]. □

The following lemma gives a relation between height of an algebraic number and its logarithm. It is useful when we apply Lemma 3.2 in the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 3.6 ([17]). *Let $\gamma_i := a^{-1}\sqrt{\Delta}(1+\alpha^{n_2-n_1}+\cdots+\alpha^{n_i-n_1})^{-1}$ be the algebraic numbers in the number field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{\Delta})$ for $1\le i\le t$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} A(i) :&= 2\log a+\log\Delta+2\left(|n_2-n_1|+\cdots+|n_i-n_1|\right)\log|\alpha|+i\log 4\\ &> \max\{2h(\gamma_i),|\log\gamma_i|\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Suppose $\ell_i := \max\left\{\frac{\log(i|b/a|)}{\log(|\alpha/\beta|)},\frac{\log(i|b/a|)}{\log|\alpha|},\frac{\log(b_s|r|/|a|)}{\log(|\alpha|/p_s^{c_1})}\right\}$ (see Lemma 3.5). We denote $\ell := \max\{\ell_1,\cdots,\ell_t\}$. If $n_1\le\ell$, then the conclusion of Theorem 1 follows trivially. Thus we may assume that $n_1>\ell$.

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1. The proof is some how motivated by [6, 17].

4. Proof of Theorem 1

Notice that if $n_t=0$ and $(t-1)\ge 2$, then it is equivalent to consider (1.6) again. If $n_t=0$ and $t=2$ then (1.6) reduces to $U_{n_1}=b_1p^{z_1}+\cdots+b_sp^{z_s}$ and hence theorem follows from [2]. Suppose $n_1=\cdots=n_t$, then (1.6) becomes $tU_{n_1}=b_1p^{z_1}+\cdots+b_sp^{z_s}$. In this case, theorem also follows from [2] by replacing b_i with b_i/t for $1\le i\le s$. From now on, we assume $n_1>n_2>\cdots>n_t$. Indeed, if some of the n_i's are equal, we can group them together obtaining a representation of U_n of the from

$$a_1U_{n_1}+a_2U_{a_1+1}+\cdots+a_rU_{a_{r-1}+1}=b_1p^{z_1}+\cdots+b_sp^{z_s}$$

with $a_1+\cdots+a_r=t$ and this equation can be handled similar to that of (1.6) with some changes in constants.

4.1. Bounding (n_1-n_i) in terms of n_1 for $2\le i\le t$.

First we estimate an upper bound for $b_1p^{z_1}+\cdots+b_{s-1}p^{z_{s-1}}$. In fact, this bound was obtained in [2]. For the sake of completeness, we write it again here. Put $\delta_1=\epsilon$, if $p_1=p_2=\cdots=p_s$. Since $p_1\leqslant\cdots\leqslant p_s$ and $z_s=\max_{1\le i\le s}z_i$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |b_1p_1^{z_1}+\cdots+b_{s-1}p_{s-1}^{z_{s-1}}| &= p_s^{z_s}\left|b_1\frac{p_1^{z_1}}{p_s^{z_s}}+\cdots+b_{s-1}\frac{p_{s-1}^{z_{s-1}}}{p_s^{z_s}}\right|\\ &\le (s-1)Kp_s^{(1-\delta_1)z_s}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where $K=\max_{1\le i\le s}b_i$ and

$$\delta_1=\min\left(\epsilon,1-\max_{p_i<p_s}(\log p_i/\log p_s)\right).$$

Here, we claim that for $2\le i\le t$, we have

$$n_1-n_i\le C_i(\log n_1)^{i-1}, \tag{4.2}$$

where C_i's are effectively computable constants depending on $\epsilon, \{U_n\}_{n\geq 0}, K,\ t, s, p_s$. We use induction on i to find an upper bound of n_1-n_i for $2\leq i\leq t$. First, we calculate the upper bound of n_1-n_2. Rewrite (1.6) as

$$\frac{a\alpha^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}-b_sp_s^{z_s}=\frac{b\beta^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}+b_1p_1^{z_1}+\cdots+b_{s-1}p_{s-1}^{z_{s-1}}-(U_{n_2}+\cdots+U_{n_t}). \tag{4.3}$$

Taking absolute value on both sides of (4.3) and using the inequality (4.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{a\alpha^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}-b_sp_s^{z_s}\right| &\leq \left|\frac{b\beta^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}\right|+|b_1p_1^{z_1}+\cdots+b_{s-1}p_{s-1}^{z_{s-1}}|+|U_{n_2}+\cdots+U_{n_t}|\\ &\leq \left|\frac{b\beta^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}\right|+(s-1)Kp_s^{(1-\delta_1)z_s}+(t-1)c_0|\alpha|^{n_2}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Now dividing both sides of the inequality (4.4) by $a\alpha^{n_1}/\sqrt{\Delta}$, we get

$$\left|1-b_sp_s^{z_s}\alpha^{-n_1}a^{-1}\sqrt{\Delta}\right|\leq\left|\frac{b\beta^{n_1}}{a\alpha^{n_1}}\right|+\frac{(s-1)\sqrt{\Delta}Kp_s^{(1-\delta_1)z_s}}{|a||\alpha|^{n_1}}+\frac{(t-1)c_0\sqrt{\Delta}|\alpha|^{n_2}}{|a||\alpha|^{n_1}}. \tag{4.5}$$

First we estimate the middle term in right hand side of (4.5). From Lemma 3.1(2),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{p_s^{(1-\delta_1)z_s}}{|\alpha|^{n_1}} &= |\alpha|^{\frac{(1-\delta_1)z_s\log p_s}{\log|\alpha|}-n_1}\\ &\leq |\alpha|^{\frac{(1-\delta_1)\log p_s}{\log|\alpha|}\frac{n_1\log|\alpha|(\log p_s+\log p_1)}{2\log p_1\log p_s}-n_1}\\ &= |\alpha|^{n_1\left(\frac{(1-\delta_1)(\log p_s+\log p_1)}{2\log p_1}-1\right)}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

If $\delta_1=1-\max_{p_i<p_s}(\log p_i/\log p_s)$ then

$$1-\delta_1=\min_{p_i<p_s}(\log p_i/\log p_s)=\log p_1/\log p_s. \tag{4.7}$$

Putting the value of $1-\delta_1$ in the inequality (4.6), we have

$$\frac{p_s^{(1-\delta_1)z_s}}{|\alpha|^{n_1}}\leq|\alpha|^{n_1\left(\frac{\log p_s+\log p_1}{2\log p_s}-1\right)}=|\alpha|^{-n_1\delta_2}, \tag{4.8}$$

where $\delta_2=(1-\frac{\log p_s+\log p_1}{2\log p_s})>0$.

Now, suppose that $\delta_1=\epsilon$. In this case, $p_1=p_2=\cdots=p_s$ and hence the inequality (4.6) becomes

$$\frac{p_s^{(1-\delta_1)z_s}}{|\alpha|^{n_1}}=\frac{p_s^{(1-\epsilon)z_s}}{|\alpha|^{n_1}}=\frac{|\alpha|^{(1-\epsilon)z_s\frac{\log p_s}{\log|\alpha|}}}{|\alpha|^{n_1}}\leq|\alpha|^{n_1(1-\epsilon-1)}\leq|\alpha|^{-\epsilon n_1}. \tag{4.9}$$

Altogether, from inequalities (4.8) and (4.9), we get

$$\frac{p_s^{(1-\delta_1)z_s}}{\alpha^{n_1}}\leq\alpha^{-\delta_3n_1}, \tag{4.10}$$

where $\delta_3=\min(\epsilon,\delta_2)$. From inequalities (4.5) and (4.10) with $|\beta|>1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|1-b_sp_s^{z_s}\alpha^{-n_1}a^{-1}\sqrt{\Delta}\right|\\&\leq\frac{|b|}{|a|}\left(\frac{|\alpha|}{|\beta|}\right)^{n_2-n_1}+\frac{(s-1)\sqrt{\Delta}K}{|a|}|\alpha|^{\delta_3(n_2-n_1)}+\frac{(t-1)c_0\sqrt{\Delta}}{|a|}|\alpha|^{n_2-n_1}\\&\leq\frac{|b|}{|a|}\left(\frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|}\right)^{n_1-n_2}+\frac{(s-1)\sqrt{\Delta}K}{|a|}\left(\frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|}\right)^{\delta_3(n_1-n_2)}+\frac{(t-1)c_0\sqrt{\Delta}}{|a|}\left(\frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|}\right)^{n_1-n_2}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.11}$$

As $0<\delta_3<1$,

$$\left|1-p_s^{z_s}\alpha^{-n_1}b_sa^{-1}\sqrt{\Delta}\right|\leq\left(\frac{|b|}{|a|}+\frac{(s-1)\sqrt{\Delta}K}{|a|}+\frac{(t-1)c_0\sqrt{\Delta}}{|a|}\right)\left(\frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|}\right)^{\delta_3(n_1-n_2)}.\tag{4.12}$$

By the same line of argument, when $|\beta|\leq1$, we have

$$\left|1-p_s^{z_s}\alpha^{-n_1}b_sa^{-1}\sqrt{\Delta}\right|\leq\left(\frac{|b|}{|a|}+\frac{(s-1)\sqrt{\Delta}K}{|a|}+\frac{(t-1)c_0\sqrt{\Delta}}{|a|}\right)|\alpha|^{-\delta_3(n_1-n_2)}.\tag{4.13}$$

Thus, for any β it follows that

$$\left|1-p_s^{z_s}\alpha^{-n_1}b_sa^{-1}\sqrt{\Delta}\right|\leq\frac{|c_3|}{\min\left(\frac{|\alpha|}{|\beta|},|\alpha|\right)^{\delta_3(n_1-n_2)}},\tag{4.14}$$

where $|c_3|=\left(\frac{|b|}{|a|}+\frac{(s-1)\sqrt{\Delta}K}{|a|}+\frac{(t-1)c_0\sqrt{\Delta}}{|a|}\right)$. In order to apply Lemma 3.2, we take

$$\gamma_1:=p_s,\ \gamma_2:=\alpha,\ \gamma_3:=b_sa^{-1}\sqrt{\Delta},\ b_1:=z_s,\ b_2:=-n_1,\ b_3=1.$$

Thus, our first linear form is $\Lambda_1:=\gamma_1^{b_1}\gamma_2^{b_2}\gamma_3^{b_3}-1$ and $\Lambda_1\neq0$ from Lemma 3.5. Here we are taking the field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{\Delta})$ over $\mathbb{Q}$ and $t=3$. Finally, we recall from Lemma 3.1(2), $z_s\leq c_1n_1$ and deduce that

$$\max\{|b_1|,|b_2|,|b_3|\}=\max\{z_s,n_1,1\}\leq c_1'n_1,$$

where $c_1'=\max\{c_1,1\}$. Hence we can take $B:=c_1'n_1$. Also $D=2,h(\gamma_1)=\log p_s,h(\gamma_2)\leq(\log\alpha)/2,h(\gamma_3)\leq\log(ab_s)+2\log\Delta$. Thus, we can take $A_1:=2\log p_s,A_2=\log\alpha,A_3=\log b_s+\log a+2\log\Delta$. Employing Lemma 3.2, we have

$$|\Lambda_1|>\exp\left(-C_0(1+\log c_1'n_1)\right),$$

where $C_0:=1.4\times30^6\times3^{4.5}\times4\times(1+\log2)(2\log p_s)(\log\alpha)(\log a+\log b_s+2\log\Delta)$. So the above inequality can be rewritten as,

$$\log|\Lambda_1|>-C_1\log n_1.\tag{4.15}$$

Taking logarithms in the inequality (4.14) and comparing the resulting inequality with (4.15), we get

$$(n_1-n_2)<C_2\log n_1. \tag{4.16}$$

Therefore, for $i=2$, the statement is true. By induction hypothesis, we may assume that (4.2) is true for $i=2,\ldots,t-1$. We want to bound n_1-n_t. So, we formulate the required linear form as follows. Again, rewrite (1.6) as

$$\left|\frac{a\alpha^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}+\cdots+\frac{a\alpha^{n_{t-1}}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}-b_sp_s^{z_s}\right|=\left|\frac{b\beta^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}+\cdots+\frac{b\beta^{n_{t-1}}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}+b_1p_1^{z_1}+\cdots b_{s-1}p_{s-1}^{z_{s-1}}+U_{n_t}\right|.$$

Using the triangle inequality and the inequality (4.1), we have

$$\left|\frac{a\alpha^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}(1+\alpha^{n_2-n_1}+\cdots+\alpha^{n_{t-1}-n_1})-b_sp_s^{z_s}\right|\leq\frac{(t-1)b|\beta|^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}+(s-1)Kp_s^{(1-\delta_1)z_s}+c_0|\alpha|^{n_t}. \tag{4.17}$$

Dividing both sides of the inequality (4.17) by $a\alpha^{n_1}(1+\alpha^{n_2-n_1}+\cdots+\alpha^{n_{t-1}-n_1})/\sqrt{\Delta}$ and using the inequality (4.10), we get the linear form as

$$\left|1-b_sp_s^{z_s}\alpha^{-n_1}a^{-1}\sqrt{\Delta}(1+\alpha^{n_2-n_1}+\cdots+\alpha^{n_{t-1}-n_1})^{-1}\right|\leq\frac{|c_5|}{\min\left(\frac{|\alpha|}{|\beta|},|\alpha|\right)^{\delta_3(n_1-n_t)}}. \tag{4.18}$$

In order to apply Lemma 3.2, we take the following parameters

$$\gamma_1:=p_s,\ \gamma_2:=\alpha,\ \gamma_3:=b_sa^{-1}\sqrt{\Delta}(1+\alpha^{n_2-n_1}+\cdots+\alpha^{n_{t-1}-n_1})^{-1},$$
$$b_1:=z_s,\ \ b_2:=-n_1,\ \ b_3=1.$$

Therefore, $\Lambda_2:=\gamma_1^{b_1}\gamma_2^{b_2}\gamma_3^{b_3}-1$. Also, $\Lambda_2\neq0$ from Lemma 3.5. As A_1,A_2 are already estimated in previous case, we have to estimate only A_3. Using Lemmas 3.4 and 3.6 we can take

$$A_3:=c_6+[(n_1-n_2)+\cdots+(n_1-n_{t-1})]c_7>\max\{2h(\gamma_3),|\log\gamma_3|,0.16\}.$$

Again, from the Lemma 3.2 and the inequality (4.18), we have

$$\exp\left(-c_8\log n_1(c_6+[(n_1-n_2)+\cdots+(n_1-n_{t-1})]c_7)\right)\leq\frac{|c_5|}{\min\left(\frac{|\alpha|}{|\beta|},|\alpha|\right)^{\delta_3(n_1-n_t)}}. \tag{4.19}$$

Using the induction hypothesis, we obtain

$$(n_1-n_t)<C_t(\log n_1)^{t-1}. \tag{4.20}$$

4.2. **Bounding n_1.** To bound n_1, we rewrite the equation (1.6) as

$$\frac{a\alpha^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}+\cdots+\frac{a\alpha^{n_t}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}-b_sp_s^{z_s}=\frac{b\beta^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}+\cdots+\frac{b\beta^{n_t}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}+b_1p_1^{z_1}+\cdots+b_{s-1}p_{s-1}^{z_{s-1}},$$

and then taking absolute value on both sides, we get

$$\left|\frac{a\alpha^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}(1+\alpha^{n_2-n_1}+\cdots+\alpha^{n_t-n_1}) - b_s p_s^{z_s}\right| \leq \left|\frac{b(\beta^{n_1}+\cdots+\beta^{n_t})}{\sqrt{\Delta}}\right| + (s-1)Kp_s^{(1-\delta_1)z_s}.$$

Now dividing through out by $\frac{a\alpha^{n_1}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}(1+\cdots+\alpha^{n_t-n_1})$, we get

$$\left|1 - b_s p_s^{z_s}\alpha^{-n_1}a^{-1}\sqrt{\Delta}(1+\alpha^{n_2-n_1}+\cdots+\alpha^{n_t-n_1})^{-1}\right| \leq \frac{|c_9|}{\min\left(\frac{|\alpha|}{|\beta|}, |\alpha|\right)^{\delta_3 n_1}}. \quad (4.21)$$

To apply Lemma 3.2, we take the following parameters.

$$\gamma_1 := p_s, \gamma_2 := \alpha, \gamma_3 := b_s a^{-1}\sqrt{\Delta}(1+\alpha^{n_2-n_1}+\cdots+\alpha^{n_t-n_1})^{-1}$$
$$b_1 := z_s, \;\; b_2 := -n_1, \;\; b_3 = 1.$$

Thus, the final linear form is $\Lambda_t := \gamma_1^{b_1}\gamma_2^{b_2}\gamma_3^{b_3} - 1$ and is non-zero by Lemma 3.5. From the conclusions of Lemma 3.4 and 3.6, we can take

$$A_3 := c_{10} + c_{11}[(n_1 - n_2) + \cdots + (n_1 - n_t)] > \max\{2h(\gamma_3), |\log\gamma_3|, 0.16\}.$$

Using Lemma 3.2 and the inequality (4.21), we have

$$\exp\left(-c_{12}\log n_1(c_{10} + c_{11}[(n_1-n_2)+\cdots+(n_1-n_t)])\right) < \frac{|c_9|}{\min\left(\frac{|\alpha|}{|\beta|}, |\alpha|\right)^{\delta_3 n_1}}. \quad (4.22)$$

Putting the upper bounds of $n_1 - n_i$ for $2 \leq i \leq t$ obtained in Section 4.1, we get

$$n_1 < C_t(\log n_1)^t, \quad (4.23)$$

and this completes the proof of Theorem 1.

5. Proof of Theorem 2

For the reason of symmetry in (2.3), we assume that $n_1 \geq n_2$. Firstly, suppose that $n_1 = n_2$. In this case, if both $z_1 \neq 0$ and $z_2 \neq 0$, then (2.3) becomes

$$2F_{n_1} = 2^{z_1} + 3^{z_2},$$

and this equation has no solution as left hand side is even and right hand side is odd. Next consider $z_1 = z_2 = 0$. In this case, (2.3) is $F_{n_1} = 1$ and this is possible only when $n_1 = 1, 2$. Hence, the solution (n_1, n_2, z_1, z_2) of (2.3) is $(1,1,0,0), (2,1,0,0), (2,2,0,0)$. Now assume that $n_1 > n_2$. Further, if $n_2 = 0$, then (2.3) becomes

$$F_{n_1} = 2^{z_1} + 3^{z_2},$$

and the list of solutions is given in [2, Table 1]. From now on, assume that $n_1 > n_2 > 0$. First we list all solutions of (2.3) with $n_1 \leq 100$. Here one can notice that z_2 is also bounded as $z_1 \leq z_2$ and

$$3^{z_2} \leq 2^{z_1} + 3^{z_2} = F_{n_1} + F_{n_2} \leq 2F_{100}.$$

To find all solutions (2.3), we use a program written in Mathematica in the range $0 < n_2 < n_1 < 100$ and $z_1 \leq z_2 \leq \log(2F_{100})/\log 3$ and and the program returns the set of solutions, which are explicitly given in (2.4). So, from here onward, we work on the assumption that $n_1 > n_2$ and $n_1 > 100$.

5.1. **Bounding $(n_1 - n_2)$ in terms of n_1.** From (2.3) and (3.1), we get

$$3^{z_2} \leq |2^{z_1} + 3^{z_2}| = |F_{n_1} + F_{n_2}| \leq 2|\alpha|^{n_1 - 1}. \tag{5.1}$$

Taking logarithms on both sides of the inequality (5.1), we obtain

$$z_2 \leq \frac{\log 2}{\log 3} + (n_1 - 1)\frac{\log|\alpha|}{\log 3} \leq 0.45 n_1. \tag{5.2}$$

We obtain the first linear form using $|\beta| < 1$ and $z_1 \leq z_2 \leq 0.45 n_1$ similar to the inequality (4.14),

$$\begin{aligned} \left|1 - 3^{z_2}\alpha^{-n_1}\sqrt{5}\right| &\leq \left(\frac{1}{|\alpha|}\right)^{n_1} + \left(\frac{2^{z_1}\sqrt{5}}{|\alpha|^{n_1}}\right) + \frac{\sqrt{5}}{|\alpha|}|\alpha|^{n_2 - n_1} \\ &\leq \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1 - n_2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

In order to apply Lemma 3.2, we take $B = n_1, h(\gamma_1) = \log 3 = 1.0986 < 1.1, h(\gamma_2) = (\log\alpha)/2 = 0.2406 < 0.25, h(\gamma_3) = \log(\sqrt{5}) < 0.81$. We can choose $A_1 = 2.2, A_2 = 0.5, A_3 = 1.7$. Using these parameters, we obtain

$$\exp(-1.8 \times 10^{12} \times (1 + \log n_1)) < \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1 - n_2}}.$$

Further, since $(1 + \log n_1) < 2\log n_1$ for $n_1 > 100$, we get

$$(n_1 - n_2)\log\left(\alpha/2^{0.45}\right) < 3.7 \times 10^{12}\log n_1, \tag{5.4}$$

which leads to

$$(n_1 - n_2) < \frac{3.7 \times 10^{12}}{\log(\alpha/2^{0.45})}\log n_1 < 2.18 \times 10^{13}\log n_1. \tag{5.5}$$

Similarly, the inequality corresponding to second linear form is

$$|1 - 3^{z_2}\sqrt{5}\alpha^{-n_1}(1 + \alpha^{n_2 - n_1})^{-1}| \leq \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1}}. \tag{5.6}$$

In this case, A_1 and A_2 are same as in the previous case, and since

$$2(\log\sqrt{5} + (n_1 - n_2)\frac{\log\alpha}{2} + \log 2) < 1.16 \times 10^{14}\log n_1,$$

we take $A_3 := 1.16 \times 10^{14}\log n_1$. Again employing Lemma 3.2, we obtain

$$\exp(-1.06 \times 10^{12} \times (1 + \log n_1)(1.16 \times 10^{14}\log n_1)) \leq \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1}} \tag{5.7}$$

and this implies

$$n_1 < \frac{2.47 \times 10^{26}}{\log(\alpha/2^{0.45})}(\log n_1)^2 < 1.45 \times 10^{27}(\log n_1)^2. \tag{5.8}$$

Now, we summarize the above discussion in the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *Let us assume that $n_1 > n_2$ and $n_1 > 100$. If (n_1, n_2, z_1, z_2) is a positive integral solution of equation (2.3), then*

$$n_1 < 9 \times 10^{30}. \tag{5.9}$$

5.2. **Reducing the size of n_1.** From Proposition 3, we can see that the bound obtained for n_1 is very large. Now our job is to reduce this upper bound to a certain minimal range. From the inequality (5.3), put

$$\Lambda_1 := z_2 \log 3 - n_1 \log \alpha + \log \sqrt{5}. \tag{5.10}$$

Then,

$$|1 - e^{\Lambda_1}| \leq \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1 - n_2}}.$$

Here, we first claim that $\Lambda_1 \neq 0$. Suppose $\Lambda_1 = 0$, then

$$3^{z_2}\sqrt{5} = \alpha^{n_1}. \tag{5.11}$$

Taking squares on both sides of (5.11), we reach at a contradiction as the left hand side of resulting equation is rational whereas the right hand side is irrational. Thus, we have $\Lambda_1 \neq 0$. Now, we consider the cases $\Lambda_1 > 0$ and $\Lambda_1 < 0$ separately.

Let us suppose that $\Lambda_1 > 0$. Since $x < e^x - 1$ holds for all positive real numbers x, we deduce

$$0 < \Lambda_1 < \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1 - n_2}}. \tag{5.12}$$

Dividing the inequality (5.12) by $\log \alpha$, we have

$$0 < z_2 \left(\frac{\log 3}{\log \alpha}\right) - n_1 + \left(\frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{\log \alpha}\right) < \frac{14}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1 - n_2}}. \tag{5.13}$$

We are now ready to use Lemma 3.3 with the obvious parameters

$$\gamma := \frac{\log 3}{\log \alpha}, \;\; \mu := \left(\frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{\log \alpha}\right), \;\; A := 14, \;\; B := (\alpha/2^{0.45}).$$

We claim that γ is irrational. In fact, if $\gamma = \frac{p}{q}$, then $\alpha^p = 3^q \in Q$ which is absurd.

Let $[a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3, \ldots] = [2, 7/3, 9/4, 16/7, \ldots]$ be a continued fraction expansion of γ and let p_k/q_k be its k-th convergent. Take $M := 9 \times 10^{30}$, then using Mathematica, one can see that

$$6M < q_{64},$$

and hence we consider $\epsilon := \|\mu q_{64}\| - M\|\gamma q_{64}\|$, which is positive. Then by Lemma 3.3, if (2.3) has a solution (n_1, n_2, z_1, z_2), then $(n_1 - n_2) \in [0, 485]$. Now, we assume the other case, i.e., $\Lambda_1 < 0$. Here we consider two sub cases according as $(n_1 - n_2) > 15$ and $(n_1 - n_2) \leq 15$.

Sub-case I.($(n_1 - n_2) \leq 15$).

Recall that, we have $n_1 > 100$ and considering this case, we get $n_2 \geq 85$. Since $\Lambda_1 < 0$, we get

$$3^{z_2} < \frac{\alpha^{n_1}}{\sqrt{5}}. \tag{5.14}$$

Now adding 2^{z_1} in both sides of (5.14), we have

$$F_{n_1} + F_{n_2} = 2^{z_1} + 3^{z_2} < \frac{\alpha^{n_1}}{\sqrt{5}} + 2^{z_1}. \tag{5.15}$$

Using the inequality (5.2) and the Binet form for F_{n_1}, the above inequality can be written as

$$F_{n_2} < \frac{\beta^{n_1}}{\sqrt{5}} + 2^{z_1} < \frac{\beta^{n_1}}{\sqrt{5}} + 2^{0.45 n_1}. \tag{5.16}$$

Since $n_1 > 100$ and $n_2 \geq 85$, we have $F_{n_2} > \frac{\beta^{n_1}}{\sqrt{5}} + 2^{0.45 n_1}$ and this contradicts the inequality (5.16). Thus, $\Lambda_1 < 0$ is not possible for $(n_1 - n_2) \leq 15$.

Sub-case II. $((n_1 - n_2) > 15)$.

In this case, one can easily check that

$$\frac{3\sqrt{5}}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1 - n_2}} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Now from (5.3)

$$|1 - e^{\Lambda_1}| < \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1 - n_2}} < \frac{1}{2} \tag{5.17}$$

which implies that

$$-\frac{1}{2} < 1 - e^{\Lambda_1} < \frac{1}{2} \tag{5.18}$$

and thus, by considering right hand side inequality of (5.18), we have $e^{|\Lambda_1|} < 2$. Since $\Lambda_1 < 0$, we have that

$$0 < |\Lambda_1| \leq e^{|\Lambda_1|} - 1 = e^{|\Lambda_1|}|1 - e^{\Lambda_1}| < \frac{6\sqrt{5}}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1 - n_2}}.$$

By proceeding in a similar way as in the case of $\Lambda_1 > 0$ with $|\Lambda_1| = -\Lambda_1$, we obtain

$$0 < n_1\gamma - z_2 + \mu < \frac{13}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1 - n_2}} \tag{5.19}$$

where

$$\gamma := \left(\frac{\log \alpha}{\log 3}\right), \ \ \mu := \left(-\frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{\log 3}\right), \ \ A := 13, \ \ B := (\alpha/2^{0.45}).$$

Here, we also took $M := 9 \times 10^{30}$ which is an upper bound for n_1. To apply Lemma 3.3, consider $\epsilon := \|\mu q_{64}\| - M\|\gamma q_{64}\|$ which is positive. If (2.3) has a solution (n_1, n_2, z_1, z_2), then maximum value of $(n_1 - n_2)$ is $484.034\ldots$.

Next, we look into the equation (5.6) to estimate the upper bound for n_1. Now put

$$\Lambda_2 := z_2 \log 3 - n_1 \log \alpha + \log \phi(n_1 - n_2),$$

where we take $\phi(x) = \sqrt{5}(1 + \alpha^{-x})^{-1}$, which implies

$$|1 - e^{\Lambda_2}| < \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1}}.$$

If $\Lambda_2 = 0$, then

$$3^{z_2}\sqrt{5} = \alpha^{n_1} + \alpha^{n_2} \tag{5.20}$$

By conjugating (5.20) and subtracting the resulting equation from (5.20), we get

$$2 \cdot 3^{z_2} = F_{n_1} + F_{n_2} = 2^{z_1} + 3^{z_2} < 2 \cdot 3^{z_2}, \tag{5.21}$$

which is not true. Thus, we have $\Lambda_2 \neq 0$. Like previous case, we consider the cases separately according as $\Lambda_2 > 0$ and $\Lambda_2 < 0$. First assume that $\Lambda_2 > 0$. By the same line of argument as before, we have

$$0 < z_2 \left(\frac{\log 3}{\log \alpha}\right) - n_1 + \left(\frac{\log \phi(n_1 - n_2)}{\log \alpha}\right) < \frac{14}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1}}. \tag{5.22}$$

Again we will use here Lemma 3.3 with the following parameters

$$\gamma := \frac{\log 3}{\log \alpha}, \ \ \mu := \frac{\log \phi(n_1 - n_2)}{\log \alpha}, \ \ A := 14, \ \ B := \alpha/2^{0.45}. \tag{5.23}$$

Proceeding like before with $M := 3 \times 10^{30}$ and applying Lemma 3.3 to the inequality (5.22) for all possible choices of $n_1 - n_2 \in [0, 485] \setminus \{2\}$ and we find that, if (2.3) has a solution (n_1, n_2, z_1, z_2), then $n_1 \in (100, 176]$.

For $(n_1 - n_2) = 2$, we have ϵ is negative. Thus, we can not apply Lemma 3.3. We use the following arguments to reduce the size of n_1 when $(n_1 - n_2) = 2$. For this case, $\phi(2) = \alpha$ and hence the inequality (5.22) becomes

$$0 < z_2 \left(\frac{\log 3}{\log \alpha}\right) - (n_1 - 1) < \frac{14}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1}}.$$

Using properties of continued fraction of irrational number $\log 3/\log \alpha$ in the above inequality, we get

$$\frac{z_2}{q_{63}(q_{64} + q_{63})} < z_2 \left|\frac{\log 3}{\log \alpha} - \frac{p_{63}}{q_{63}}\right| < z_2 \left|\frac{\log 3}{\log \alpha} - \frac{(n_1 - 1)}{z_2}\right| < \frac{14}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1}}, \tag{5.24}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{1}{(q_{64} + q_{63})} < \frac{(14 q_{63}/z_2)}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1}}.$$

Now using Mathematica for $n_1 = 9 \times 10^{30}$ and $z_2 = 0.45 n_1 = 4.05 \times 10^{30}$, we have

$$n_1 < \frac{\log\left(14 \cdot q_{63}/z_2\right)}{\log\left(\alpha/2^{0.45}\right)} < 488. \tag{5.25}$$

In a similar way, when $\Lambda_2 < 0$, we obtain

$$0 < n_1\gamma - z_2 + \mu < \frac{13}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1 - n_2}} \tag{5.26}$$

where

$$\gamma := \left(\frac{\log \alpha}{\log 3}\right), \quad \mu := \left(-\frac{\log \phi(n_1 - n_2)}{\log 3}\right), \quad A := 13, \quad B := (\alpha/2^{0.45}).$$

By applying Lemma 3.3 to the inequality (5.19) for all possible choices of $n_1 - n_2 \in [0, 485] \setminus \{2\}$, we find that if (2.3) has a solution (n_1, n_2, n_3, z), then $n_1 \in (100, 179]$.

For $n_1 - n_2 = 2$, by the same line argument, from the inequality (5.26), we have

$$\frac{(n_1 - 1)}{q_{64}(q_{65} + q_{64})} < (n_1 - 1)\left|\frac{\log \alpha}{\log 3} - \frac{p_{64}}{q_{64}}\right| < (n_1 - 1)\left|\frac{\log \alpha}{\log 3} - \frac{z_2}{(n_1 - 1)}\right| < \frac{13}{(\alpha/2^{0.45})^{n_1}}. \tag{5.27}$$

Now using Mathematica, we get $n_1 < 493$. Thus, for all cases we have $n_1 \in (100, 493]$ and hence $z_2 \leq 222$.

This upper bound of z_2 is still very large for computational purpose. Further, we reduce the size of z_2 by using 3-adic valuation. Here, notice that $\nu_3(F_{n_1} + F_{n_2} - 2^{z_1}) = z_2$. We need to exclude the trivial cases when $F_{n_1} + F_{n_2} - 2^{z_1} = 0$, as the valuation is infinite. Thus, Mathematica returns $\nu_3(F_{n_1} + F_{n_2} - 2^{z_1}) \leq 12$, and the estimate $\alpha^{n_1 - 2} \leq F_{n_1} + F_{n_2} \leq 2 \cdot 3^{z_2}$ gives $n_1 \leq 40$. This is a contradiction as $n_1 > 100$ which completes the proof of the Theorem 2.

References

[1] A. Baker and H. Davenport, The equations $3x^2 - 2 = y^2$ and $8x^2 - 7 = z^2$, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.* **20** (1969), 129–137.

[2] C. Bertók, L. Hajdu, I. Pink, and Z. Rábai, Linear combinations of prime powers in binary recurrence sequences, to appear in *Int. J. Number Theory* DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S1793042117500166.

[3] J. J. Bravo, C. A. Gómez, and F. Luca, Powers of two as sums of two k-Fibonacci numbers, *Miskolc Math. Notes* **17** (2016), 85–100.

[4] J. J. Bravo and F. Luca, Power of two as sums of two Lucas numbers, *J. Integer Seq.* **17** (2014), A.14.8.3.

[5] E. F. Bravo and J. J. Bravo, Power of two as sums of three Fibonacci sequence, *Lith. Math. J.* **55** (2015), 301–311.

[6] J. J. Bravo and F. Luca, Power of two as sums of two Fibonacci numbers, *Quaest. Math.* **39** (2016), 391–400.
[7] Y. Bugeaud, M. Mignotte and S. Siksek, Classical and modular approaches to exponential Diophantine equations I. Fibonacci and Lucas perfect powers, *Ann Math.* **163** (2006), 969–1018.
[8] M. Bugeaud, M. Mignotte, F. Luca and S. Siksek, Fibonacci numbers at most one away from a perfect power, *Elem. Math.* **63**(2) (2008), 65-75.
[9] J. H. E. Cohn, Perfect Pell powers, *Glasg. Math. J.* **38** (1996), 19–20.
[10] A. Dujella and A. Pethő, A generalization of a theorem of Baker and Davenport, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.* **49** (1998), 291–306.
[11] F. Luca, Fibonacci numbers of the form $k^2 + k + 2$, in *Applications of Fibonacci numbers*, Vol. 8 (Rochester, NY, 1998), 241-249, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1999.
[12] F. Luca and L. Szalay, Fibonacci numbers of the form $p^a \pm p^b + 1$, *Fibonacci Quart.* **45**(2) (2007), 98-103.
[13] F. Luca and P. Stănică, Fibonacci numbers of the form $p^a \pm p^b$, *Congr. Numer.* **194**(2) (2009), 177-183.
[14] D. Marques and A Togbé, Fibonacci and Lucas numbers of the form $2^a + 3^b + 5^c$, *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.* **89** (2013), 47 - 50.
[15] D. Marques, Powers of two as sum of two generalized Fibonacci numbers, available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.2704.
[16] E. M. Matveev, An explicit lower bound for a homogeneous rational linear form in the logarithms of algebraic numbers, *Izv. Math.* **64** (2000), 1217–1269.
[17] E. Mazumdar and S. S. Rout, Prime powers in sums of terms of binary recurrence sequences, *arXiv:1610.02774*.
[18] A. Pethő, Perfect powers in second order linear recurrences, *J. Number Theory* **15** (1982), 5-13.
[19] A. Pethő, The Pell sequence contains only trivial perfect powers, *Coll. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai, 60 sets, Graphs and Numbers, Budapest* (1991), 561-568.
[20] A. Pethő and R. F. Tichy, S-unit equations, linear recurrences and digit expansions, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **42** (1993), 145-154.
[21] I. Pink and V. Ziegler, Effective resolution of Diophantine equations of the form $u_n + u_m = wp_1^{z_1} \cdots p_s^{z_s}$, http://arxiv.org/abs/1604.0472.
[22] N. Robbins, Fibonacci numbers of the forms $pX^2 \pm 1, pX^3 \pm 1$, where p is prime, in *Applications of Fibonacci numbers*, Vol. 8 (San Jose, CA, 1986), 77-88, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1988.
[23] T. N. Shorey and C. L. Stewart, On the Diophantine equation $ax^{2t} + bx^t y + cy^2 = d$ and pure powers in recurrence sequences, *Math. Scand.* **52** (1983), 24-36.

Nabin Kumar Meher, Harish-Chandra Research Institute (HBNI), Chhatnag Road, Jhunsi, India, 211019

E-mail address: mehernabin@gmail.com

Sudhansu Sekhar Rout, Departament of Mathematics, Harish-Chandra Research Institute (HBNI), Chhatnag Road, Jhunsi, India, 211019

E-mail address: lbs.sudhansu@gmail.com